

January 27, 1976

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 432 is a bill that was considered yesterday. Mr. President, there is a request ... a motion by Senator Swigart to bracket the bill to February 20th. That motion was under discussion at the time of our adjournment. There is now a new motion to amend, offered by Senator Chambers. The motion to bracket is still pending.

PRESIDENT: Well is that a motion to amend the motion to bracket, Senator Chambers?

CLERK: No, the motion to amend is to the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: We'll dispose of the motion to bracket before proceeding to any further motions. Anyone wish to speak further on the matter of bracketing? Senator Swigart, do you wish to be heard on the matter of bracketing?

SENATOR SWIGART: Mr. Chairman, colleagues. Yes, just briefly. Senator Chambers did bring us this amendment. I certainly want to say it's not without merit. It seems to me it's quite sudden for us here. We haven't had time to digest it or to see how it would apply. It seems to me we ought to bracket this and study all matters at the time we have them all before us. So I still hold to my effort to bracket until the 20th, because the hearing will then have been had on the other bill, 782. We can take it all up together. I do not want to say that I'm offended with this effort here to amend. I simply would like to take it all up together on the 20th.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, would you speak to the bracketing matter please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature. I am not going to argue any points of the bill. I won't refer to the amendment. Could I just mention that there is one on the desk so that we don't have to go through printing it up again.

I'm opposed to bracketing the bill for the reasons that I gave yesterday. The bill should stand or fall on its own merits. I've also been given some friendly council and advice from a few of the Senators here who apparently see what I do from a different perspective than I do since I'm the one whose participating in it.

I do want to say this, the bill does have merit. It relates to the training and the proper qualification and regulation of special deputies who are not real deputy sheriffs. I think it's a highly unusual procedure, unless it's designed to kill the bill through delay. But it's a highly unusual procedure to act on such a speculative occurrence as the advancement of a bill from a committee before you consider another bill. If that bill does not get out of committee then I wonder what the outcome of the whole thing is going to be. If you feel that the deputies ought not be regulated, if you feel they need no training, if you feel they should be allowed to strap on guns, in other words if you disagree with the opinion of, I would say, all the top police authorities in the state, including the Director of the Law Enforcement Training Center at Grand Island, you wouldn't find the State Patrol having voluntary state patrolmen, whether they're trained or not.